

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Vol IX, No. 5

Price 10 Cents

Labor Donated

D
E
C
1
9
4
8

MORALS:

Marxist, Stalinist, Capitalist

Right & Left Arm of Capitalism:

FASCISM

AND

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

Published by

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS
LEAGUE

U. S. A.

DEMOS PRESS
708 N. CLARK ST.
CHICAGO, ILL.

MORALS:

MARXIST, STALINIST, CAPITALIST

DOES THE MEANS JUSTIFY THE END

The problems of morals and ethics, like the problem of economics, politics, democracy and dictatorship, are class problems based upon the special historical and material conditions of a given society. These problems are not the codes, theories and values that transcend to pure reason, with universal and eternal values as the religious teachers would have us believe. This thought is most annoying to the religious moralists. They object to revolutionary Marxists invading their special field of morals and ethics. But to dialectical materialists, this is our field too, even though we are pressed for time and cannot devote as much time to it as we do to political and economic struggles.

In order to quiet the religious moralists we may say that this article is not mainly concerned with their unscientific concepts on morals. In this article we are mainly concerned with another aspect of the problem. Our main concern in this article is morals in relation to Stalinism and to the capitalists in general and this part of the problem particularly in relation to Marxism. The capitalist apologists direct their attack against Marxism, to discredit it, by attacking Stalinism on the question of morals and ethics, making an amalgam out of Stalinism and Marxism; thereby leaving the impression upon the mass of readers that Marxism stands for these warped, and often vulgar, anti-working class concepts.

In dealing mainly with the relation of Marxism to Stalinism and Capitalism we will only deal in brief with the laws and jurisdictional aspects of the problem within the Soviet Union. This phase of the problem is a big book in itself. Instead we are mainly presenting an outline based upon the concepts of revolutionary Marxism, and research work in these fields must follow the same general line of march.

The Stalinists within the Soviet Union and their national disciples throughout the world have revised Marxism on its basic principles, and therefore, from this flows their revisionism on the class approach to morals and ethics. It is sad to say that in many respects the left capitalist democrats have a superior (from a class point of view) moral position to that of the Stalinists. In many respects the Stalinist moral concepts are identical with the reactionary and fascist wings of the capitalists.

The legalizing and crystalizing into laws within the Soviet Union, and the following out of this plan in all countries by their followers exemplifies their closeness to fascism and their distance from left capitalist democrats on certain moral concepts in relation to THE WORKING CLASS.

The Stalinists' brutal slave labor exile and murder of working class political opponents; from right wing Bucharin to centrist Trotsky, adding up to millions within the Soviet Union, is one example. The Slave Labor legal code, which imprisons millions of Russians and foreign labor for the bureaucrats needs is another example. Their legal "gymnastics", frame-ups of working class political opponents, the mock and fake trials they have held in the Soviet Union against countless leaders who opposed them from the left, even though they may not have opposed them from the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism is still another example. Also the Stalinists mockery of Lenin's position on open diplomacy with the capitalists and imperialist powers, their outstanding betrayal in this respect was the Hitler-Stalin Pact, the Secret War agreements with the fascists, their former entry into the Old League of Nations, etc., all of these positions presented by the Stalinists, codified in legal terms in the Soviet Union now are but a drop in the bucket of their moral crimes AGAINST THE WORKERS OF THE WORLD, against the moral concepts of Marxism in its working class approach to morals and ethics.

The Stalinist elevation of the state apparatus, all the way from the trade union officials up to the decorated generals and diplomats, elevation above and with a wide gap between these bureaucrats and the broad masses is another example of this anti-working class moral concept which inevitably flow from these economic discrepancies. These few examples indicate their kinship with reactionary capitalism and fascism in its moral roughshod methods of conquest, and show their inferiority to left bourgeois-democracy, not to speak of revolutionary Marxism.

When we speak against the crimes of Stalinism in relation to the workers and other left political opponents and say nothing against the way they have handled the reactionaries and fascists as well as simple capitalists, one may draw the conclusion that we sanction these methods against the right and only oppose it against the left. No, not by a long shot. Revolutionary Marxists will have a different approach, will treat the capitalist opposition different than a workers' opposition, the former as enemies and the latter as critical and may be misled friends, but even on this basis, in handling the capitalist opposition firmly to protect the workers' interests, we would NOT deal with them as the Stalinist do. Weaknesses, in theory and in the social material conditions in relation to the enemy often causes panic and drastic un-called for measures; while strength in theory, even though not so strong permits a simpler, milder, safer way to oppose the real enemies. Overt and unnecessary cruelty is a sign of weakness.

For example, the Palmer raids and what followed yesterday; and the UnAmerican committee activities and the Clark "loyalty" witch-hunt, etc. today, are examples of this position on the part of the capitalists. Nine innocent liberal minded persons are discriminated against and persecuted versus one "guilty" Stalinist or what have you. They are guilty only from the false standpoint of these reactionaries in the capitalist democratic government. Likewise, the Stalinist hysteria with the Kirov assassination in the Soviet Union in the thirties, when thousands of innocent workers and critical employees in the apparatus were sent into exile and many killed. These are moral problems of the individual in relation to the state; these are moral problems of the class in relation to the state. And they are vital in setting the

pattern for the moral problems of the individual in relation to his family, his blood relatives, his fellow workers, his friends, his organizations, his political party, his sex relations, and his whole outlook upon man and the universe.

Let us return to the beginning again and retrace our steps through the theoretical and practical problems we have stated that we are going to discuss. Morality, say the best dictionaries is, "The doctrine of moral duties of life or men in their social character." "The practice of moral duties..." "Observance of right and wrong..." We could go on quoting these almost endlessly, but we would still be in the clouds. To bring the subject to what we consider the decisive question we will quote Engels in ANTI-DUHRING:

"We therefore reject every attempt to impose on us any moral dogma whatsoever as an eternal, ultimate and forever immutable moral law on the pretext that the moral world too has its permanent principles which transcend history and the difference between nations. We maintain on the contrary that all former moral theories are the product, in the last analysis of the economic stage which society has reached at that particular epoch. And as society has hitherto moved in class antagonism, morality was always class morality; it has either justified the domination and interest of the ruling class, or, as soon as the oppressed class became powerful enough, it has represented the revolt against this domination and the future interest of the oppressed. That in this process there has on the whole been progress in morality, as in all other branches of human knowledge, cannot be doubted. But we have not yet passed beyond class morality. A real human morality which transcends class antagonism and their legacies in thought becomes possible only at a stage of society which has not only overcome class contradictions but has even forgotten them in practical life."

We can see from this scientific concept that the Soviet Union which is not capitalist, but which is far, very far from socialism still represents class contradictions, not only internally, but especially in its international relations with imperialism. Even though capitalism is in decay, and rapid decay at that, it still represents the stronger of the two; especially with the powerful position of the United States. And in addition we are very far from "forgetting" class relations in "practical life" in the Soviet Union under its disintegrating transition economy which is only the first stage TOWARD socialism.

Let us make it clear here and now, that even if the Soviet Union were under Marxist leadership, and the transition economy were progressing toward socialism, instead of disintegrating, warped, transition economy, we would still have carryovers of bourgeois morals and legal forms that could only be wiped out with higher productive levels and higher social levels of a new society. We do not accuse Stalinism of these carryovers. What we say is that they not only retard this healthy development toward a higher classless morality; but their revisionism and bureaucratic MATERIAL norms warp and bring out all the bad features of class morality in general and bureaucratic selfish interest against society in particular. This means that Stalinism not only uses all the filthy methods that class morality has developed; but they also warp, distort and reject the norms and teachings that would help lead the people toward a higher classless morality.

Marx in GERMAN IDEOLOGY SAID, "Men are the producers of their concepts, ideas, etc. - but real, producing men, as they are conditioned by a definite development of their productive forces and the intercourse, up to its most far-reaching forms, which corresponds with these. Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of men in their actual life process. If in all ideology men and their relations appear upside down, as in a camera obscura, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the reversal of objects on the retina does from their direct physical life-process."

Here again we have more information clearly stating that morality, any ideas, etc., cannot arise above the material, economic and social conditions of the class AS A PATTERN OF CONDUCT FOR THE MASSES. It is up to the scientists, the revolutionary Marxists and theoreticians of the working class to point out the road ahead, to lay down the line for the masses, because of the farsightedness of real leadership, and above all to live examples to be followed.

If we claim to be revolutionary Marxists, if our morality is superior to that of the exploiters, if we "crusade" for a classless morality, of a future classless socialist society, than we must not only practice what we preach, and try to live examples of this future pattern; but above all we can at least point out our transitional social shortcomings (as Lenin did, and as Trotsky did up until the period after Hitler took power, when Trotsky began wholesale revisionism) in the Soviet Union, and present a front in ALL HUMAN RELATIONS far superior to that of the liberals. For Marxists this is natural and easy; for Stalinists this is impossible.

Let us get down to cases. When we say we should present a moral code superior to that of the best wing of the exploiters, does this mean we should be like the pious Christians who really don't know the world they live in and who try to follow a moral code that has no relation to life? Of course not. Engel's quotation clearly shows where we stand on this question. These codes followed by the different religious believers are outdated class morality. Scientific, economic and social development in modern capitalist states have already passed beyond these moral codes. That is the reflection of the breakdown of their legal codes in marriage, crime, sex relations, and legal forms for many property relations.

If we reject these pious moral codes does it mean that we can let our emotions reign, become free to follow our emotional reactions and cast all morals to the winds? We admit that army of the emotional types often called the lunatic fringe of the radical movements do just this, and we admit the Bohemian or Greenwich Village, or the new California "cults" on the radical fringe are obsessed with ideas of emotional freedom. Most often the emotional freedom does not run along channels of service to mankind, to the working class in particular; but most often along individual self-satisfying sex lines. This is a caricature of revolutionary Marxian teachings on morals. In rejecting the class morals of the exploiters we do not degenerate to their slum type of morals.

DOES THE END JUSTIFY THE MEANS?

The best approach to the above problem in order to give our point

of view is to deal with the concept that the end justifies the means. This concept has enabled the Stalinists to get away with the most brutal crimes against the working class and workers' organizations and to practice murder--always saying that the end justifies the means. They turn this off as Marxism. And the exploiter's newsmen agree with them to discredit Marxism by claiming that Lenin and the Marxists advocated this concept to the fullest extent.

This is far from the truth. The Stalinists and the yellow journalists who agree with them have taken the phrase out of its context--they rather retranslated the phrase to give it a different content than that given to it by the Marxists.

What is our end? And what is our means to obtain our ends? By answering these questions we can more readily bring out our real content. Our end is not--just the overthrow of the capitalists. Our end is not--just the establishment of workers state power with their own workers council government. These are major steps toward our end. Our end is to establish a society based upon production for use; to establish a classless society, from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.

In this revolutionary struggle to transform society and mankind the key lever at each phase of the "means" right on through to the "ends" is the working class. Without loyalty to the INTEREST OF THE WORKING CLASS at each given stage of the struggle, every minute of the struggle toward the end, and without loyalty to our "ends" there can be no real progress toward our goal, toward a higher civilization for mankind.

This means that we cannot advocate means that will violate our ends. This means we cannot carry through means that will deny our ends. This means that we cannot adopt means that will revise our ends. In other words, the advocacy or adoption of means that revise the ends, shows that we have approved tactics and strategy that revise and contradict our principle. Our principles are those fundamentals which will assure us our end and are an integral part of our revolutionary Marxian ends in the class society under which we live.

The phrase "ends justify the means" for revolutionary Marxists means tactical and strategical changes in means to obtain our ends; and it does not mean principle changes to obtain our ends, because ends can not be obtained if principles are violated. Is Stalinism any closer to the goal, the end now than when it started? The Stalinists are farther away from the end now than at any time in the past.

As long as one keeps the INTEREST OF THE WORKING CLASS as the key in his struggle with means toward the ends he cannot twist the phrase out of its content as the Stalinists do. For example:

Since Stalinism has forsaken the content, the INTEREST OF THE WORKING CLASS, and the goal of the classless society of production for use, they have --

- Revised the principles of Marxism as a means to their ends.
- Enslaved millions of workers as a means to their ends.
- Killed thousands of revolutionists as a means to their ends.
- Imprisoned and tortured countless revolutionary Marxists as a means to their ends.
- Lied to the working class as a means to their ends.

Betrayed the working class in countless countries as a means to their ends.

Held the workers of the Soviet Union in ignorance of the decisive questions for revolutionary Marxian enlightenment as a means to their end of retaining state power for the usurping bureaucrats.

Countless other examples can be given, but these are sufficient to reveal what we mean.

If the interest of the working class and the goal of revolutionary Marxism were placed as the pivotal point it can be seen that all the above are negations, are violations of the true meaning of the "ends justify the means."

Let us put the question this way. For a doctor the end is to keep patients alive, to make them well, but above all to keep them alive. Within that framework, to make the patient well, to keep the patient alive, the means justify the ends. But if the means KILL the patient for the INTEREST OF THE DOCTOR (Stalinist Bureaucrats) instead of the interest of the patient (Working Class) then the content of the concept has been violated.

This covers broad theoretical aspects of the problem. Now let us return to another concrete example. The exploiter's paid scribes, speaking of "the means justify the end" argue against the Marxists because Lenin "lied" to the exploiters. From this they argue that this proves that Lenin advocated lies, a thing the good "Christians" don't do. And from this the Stalinists draw the conclusions that since we can lie, it is, for the good of the ends, to use the means of lying to the working class, as the Stalinists have done on so many countless times that examples are not needed.

The Stalinists have thrown the "baby out with the bath." They violate the INTEREST OF THE WORKING CLASS. But if a revolutionist tells a lie to the exploiters there is no violation of the workers interest. The maxim for revolutionary Marxists is that you cannot lie to the working class. But a lie to the exploiters is no crime. What is good for one class is bad for another class. It reveals our concept of what is good and what is evil. In the problems of economics what is good for the exploiters is bad for the exploited, etc.

Clausewitz pointed out that diplomacy and military art is one lie after another. This is in the good Christian world of the exploiters. In military war the means justify the ends in relation to the ENEMY: but this does not mean that the means justify the ends in relation to the general staff, their own country, their own state. If they would twist the phrase around to mean their own country, their own state, it would mean the defeat of what they are fighting for. But the Stalinists have elevated themselves above their own people and defeat the ends by their false means.

No, the yellow journalists may accuse Stalinism of this crime; but they cannot accuse the revolutionary Marxists of the degenerated morality of the "ends justify the means" in its vulgar content.

In conclusion let us repeat, if one were to sacrifice his goal, his ends, to justify his "means" to an "end", tell us, what good are

ends and principles? When the reformist and Labor Party Socialists substitute day to day reforms for ends, and continue to give "lip service" to the ends, it is in reality a sacrifice of the ends. When the Stalinists murder revolutionaries, and Marxists, and enslave the proletariat, as a means toward an end (?) this is the negation of revolutionary Marxist ends.

THE CAPITALIST DOUBLE STANDARD

Under the system of capitalist exploitation of man by man there has been carried over from previous systems of exploitation the double standard. It has been modified in form considerably, but it retains its basic content as before. For example, the legal forms of the Middle Ages, when knights were the elite, it was the proper norm for knights in dispute to settle their differences on the field of honor to death. It was agreed legally and morally that he who won the combat was innocent and he who lost the combat was guilty. The only change from then to now is the change in the relation of the individual to society. This form of combat is no longer considered RIGHT for the individual; but this form of combat (Might is right) is considered the natural and normal relation between companies, trusts, cartels, nations, armies, etc.

The capitalist exploiters continue to carry on the double social standard. This double social standard expresses itself in every form of social activity: in sex, business, government, army and all social and economic activity. It is discrimination of one's fellow man, based upon the class distinction concept and the economic status of humans; rather than a code based upon human relations of equity.

This double standard is most obvious in sex relations under class society. It is all right for the male to sow his wild oats, but not for the female. It is the woman who pays the bill in any taboo relationship of sex under the system of exploitation. Is there anything ethical, honest or fair about this arrangement? Furthermore the normal sex relation under capitalism winks at the condition whereby the male can carry on extra-marital relations, providing he is not caught and can keep his social position and above all pay for it. The crime is to be caught in this extra-marital sex relation, not the relationship itself.

The revolutionary Marxists reject the above concept; but we also reject the pious Christian concept and the Catholic concept of sex relations. Likewise we reject the normal capitalist sex relationship of prostitution, which is so prevalent under all systems of exploitation.

In place of these false, unnatural and twisted sex relations of class society we advocate a free sex relationship of equals based upon human consideration and honesty with a given partner in love. Under capitalism, and before economic and social conditions lay the foundations for higher human relations, the best that can be obtained is an honest, above board and open relationship of equals. It is based upon such an elementary and simple concept, that for the sex "educated" under capitalism it is like a needle lost in the haystack.

If two people agree on a partnership to cross a dangerous jungle swamp they should be honest with each other and cooperate with each other; neither should hold out on the other. It is like true "buddies" in any difficult situation which has its ups and downs. As long as the

partnership exists there cannot be any doublecross. Such nullifies the contract, the partnership in content even though it may not in name. So too with sex relations. Two humans who agree to be loyal and true to each other should carry out the bargain. If and when the partnership becomes negative it should be agreed open and above board to terminate it. Such an understanding should be made at the beginning. But in all cases the male is equally responsible for children under present day economic conditions.

In reference to government, business and social and economic life one needs only go to the local library and check the books listed on discrimination in these fields, discrimination against racial, national and the economic poor to realize that equality of human relations under a class society is a farce. The hate, prejudice, and discrimination against racial and national groups represents the most degrading forms of exploiter's ethical sanctions which flow from a civilization based upon the exploitation of man by man. These ethical problems are underneath economic problems, reflecting the economic foundation below hate prejudice and discrimination against other peoples. A revolutionary Marxist must not only train himself in these ethical problems, but above all must put into practice as part of the class struggle these problems. Naturally individuals cannot solve these problems under capitalism; it is a social solution under a new form of society that is essential. But individuals, class-conscious workers can take the correct position and according to the concrete situation tactically and strategically advance these positions for the greatest good to involve the greatest possible numbers.

It is not brains and ability that determine your status under capitalism or any system of exploitation; it is who you know and money that determine the most favorable positions in the social system. There are exceptions to this rule, but this is the GENERAL rule.

In the trade union movement you often encounter the bureaucrats who have just come back from some kind of a negotiation with the company; and who say in the small circle discussing the results that this information cannot be given to the membership. In fact it is commonplace to withhold from the members most of the actual relations with the employers. This is the most unethical, filthy relationship one can have with the union members. What goes on with the boss is the property of the membership. Since the exploiters already know the situation, to keep the union members in the dark is to give the employers the tactical and strategical lead in that given situation and the next move to follow. What should be kept from the boss and from the members for a time, are those moves contemplated by the executive committee of the union which they do NOT WANT THE EMPLOYERS to know about YET. In due time the bosses will know; but first inform the membership.

The shop steward of the union in a department who does not inform and explain to the members his every move with the management is unethical with his fellow workers. The worker who says one thing to the boss about his fellow workers and who tells his co-workers another story is unethical in his job relations.

But the class conscious trade unionist or revolutionist who keeps secrets from his employers and their state, and even has to tell a white lie now and then is not unethical. We live under a class society

and ethics basically remain class ethics and one must know where his ethical interests exist, just like he must know where his class interest exists, regardless of what his momentary, individual interest may be.

These represent a few examples of ethical problems as we see it. A whole book could be written about the ethical problems of the working class, of equal humans, even under a decaying class society of capitalism. Emily Post's etiquette basically concerns itself with "polite" society. What is needed is a book of ethical and polite relations for humans in their work, social and play relations.

10-22-48

FASCISM AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

THE RIGHT AND LEFT ARM OF THE BOURGEOISIE

The axis of our position starts with the premise that capitalism has outlived its usefulness, that it is a brake upon further progress, that it is reactionary and must be overthrown, and in its place we must establish communism through a transition period. On this basis every party that stands for the preservation of the capitalist system is REACTIONARY, no matter how its METHOD of control of the working class may differ from that of any other party. In the present decay stage of capitalism there can be no progressive liberal capitalists. Today the only progressive force in society is the proletariat.

Only that party of the working class that represents in its program and action the INTERESTS of the proletariat can be a progressive party. Does this mean that all other parties are reactionary? Yes! Does this mean we list all such parties as one reactionary mass? No! Such would be a mechanical, false conclusion. All parties that uphold the capitalist system are enemies of the working class. But they use different methods of controlling the working class. These different methods reflect above all the antagonism within the camp of the exploiters, their relations to each other and their relation to the oppressed masses. The different methods of control of the working class are applied at different stages of the class struggle, of the class relations, to advance the exploiter's interests as a whole, to best back the workers and to advance the sectional interests of the ruling group of the exploiters.

The exploiters use essentially two methods to control the workers. These are the "conservative" and "democratic" methods, or the "Fascist" and "People's Front" method. These two methods are the right and left arms of the bourgeoisie. In content there is no difference, in method there is a big difference. These two forms take on different aspects depending upon the stage of the class struggle within the country. Each method is represented usually by more than one party at one time. These parties represent sectional conflicts, changing tempos in the class relations, etc. All can be traced back to shifting economic conditions of the exploiters and exploited within the country in relation to the mode of production. At each stage of the class struggle both methods are in play ready for use. In the decay stage, if the proletarian pressure increases, but the economic base of capitalism is strong and the leadership of the proletariat weak, the cheapest method to hold the workers in check is the "democratic bourgeois" one.

Only after the left arm fails to hold in check the proletariat is

the right arm able to bring forth its solution. The bourgeois rule shifts back and forth from left to right in the upward spiral of the class struggle from the beginning of capitalism until the revolutionary situation brings out the highest form of both arms, the People's Front left arm and the Fascist right arm. Both methods go through an evolution in each country depending upon changing class relations.

The democratic bourgeoisie in the stage of developing capitalism (in the main) does not call upon the reformist agents in the workers ranks to help them in the political field in their struggle against the workers. In this stage these agents do their most effective work on the economic field. But in the decay stage, to the degree of the increased pressure of the proletariat, the capitalists are forced to call into their political service the agents within the workers ranks. Their job is to hold in check the proletariat, when the exploiters are exposed and can no longer carry out this task as effectively as before.

The democratic bourgeoisie are able to control the masses by a special means. Whereas the secret of the Fascist "victory" is the winning of the middle class to be used for a decisive defeat of the proletariat in civil war, the People's Front or democratic bourgeoisie's victory is based upon a third force.

This third force is represented by the agents of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the proletariat. The strength of these agents, the reformist leaders, in the ranks of the proletariat, rests upon their control of the trade unions, other workers organizations and "working class" political parties. Objectively this third force, as agents of the exploiters in the workers ranks, is likewise reactionary.

The typical historical example of the three forces and two methods of rule are the British Conservative Party, Liberal Party and Labor Party. The left arm carries through the rule of the exploiters with sugarcoated methods, with crumbs for the exploited, while the right arm uses the strong arm method of domination of the exploited. The agents of the exploiters in the ranks of the exploited serve the capitalists through the democratic bourgeoisie.

This third group of parties (Labor, Farmer-Labor, Socialist and "Communist") that present a non-Marxist program, a program contrary to the interests of the proletariat, are working class parties in form and bourgeois parties in content. In content there are only two kinds of parties - bourgeois parties and a proletarian party. Some are petty-bourgeois in make-up, but in content they are bourgeois.

At no time must the proletariat subordinate its organizations and its actions to the democratic bourgeoisie. At all times the independent action of the proletariat can be assured only upon the basis of the POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL INDEPENDENCE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIAN ORGANIZATION. It is not Social-democracy and Fascism, or the People's Front and Fascism that are twins. In content they are the same, but their methods of control of the workers are different and the exploiters' agents in the workers ranks have control of WORKERS ORGANIZATIONS on the economic field that must be won by the revolutionists. The theory that there is one reactionary mass and the theory that there is one capitalist group, the democratic (vs. the Fascist) which the workers must support are two peas from the same pod. This ultra-leftism

and opportunism has the same roots, representing two aspects of one basic error.

The two main methods of bourgeois rule are flanked on the left by an important bourgeois democratic subdivision - the "labor" parties of the Reformist agents within the workers ranks.

The economic conflict between Fascism and the People's Front,

Strange as it may seem, the basic economic antagonism between Fascism and the People's Front is not merely their group interests. A revolutionary crisis in decay capitalism reveals the inability of the democratic bourgeoisie to continue as the rulers of the exploiters, their inability to reorganize production to make profits, their inability to hold in check the proletariat. In this period their main difference revolves around how to save the economic system from complete collapse, how to hold in check the class struggle that flows from this economic decay.

In addition to this basic difference there remains the difference of group interest in this struggle. If the Fascists dislodge the People's Front from State power, the new group that takes over the state has new advantages. Furthermore the armed struggle or lack of armed struggle between these two arms of the exploiters depend upon the following, as was revealed by the contrast of the German Fascists struggle for power and the Spanish Fascists struggle for power: 1 - The degree of working class pressure against capitalism. This is fundamental. 2- The relation of the agrarian carryover to the country as a whole. 3- The concrete economic difference of the two contending capitalist groups. 4- The imperialist utilization of the struggle within the weak link for their own ends.

The political formula - Communism vs Fascism -- and not Fascism vs Democracy in Germany, Austria and today in Spain, flows from the economic axis dealt with above. The fight to save the capitalist system is fundamentally a struggle between Communism and Fascism, with the People's Front (democratic bourgeoisie) helpless in between the two main contending forces.

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

1 - Popular Front - a form of bourgeois rule.

The Popular Front is a form of bourgeois rule, typified in content in the present decay stage of capitalism by the following forms: Provisional Government of Russia in 1917; 1918 Social-Democratic government in Germany; British Labor Party Government in 1925; Blum Government in France; and the present Spanish People's Front Government. The American form of the People's Front is the Labor and Farmer-Labor Party.

2 - Instrument of democratic bourgeoisie to subordinate the proletariat. Through the People's Front the democratic bourgeois section of the exploiters using democratic bourgeois methods are able to subordinate and control the proletariat and oppressed masses, thereby tied to Finance Capitalism.

3- People's Front a result of new class relations.

The People's Front is the result of new class relations in decay capitalism. When the strength of the proletariat and oppressed masses push beyond the former bourgeois class controlled avenues, when the "old" methods no longer suffice to hold in check the proletariat, the left arm of the bourgeoisie is used as a METHOD OF CONTROL. This is a negative reflection of a pre-revolutionary or revolutionary situation, whereby the increasing pressure of the exploited masses is momentarily safely canalized by the democratic bourgeoisie. The main purpose of the People's Front is to hold in check the rising proletariat, is to lull them to sleep, to disarm them to enable the exploiters to prepare for the decisive battle against the proletariat.

4- Reformist role in the People's Front.

The section of the exploiters using the bourgeois democratic method versus the section using the reactionary method (Fascists, etc) are able to subordinate the proletariat to the People's Front only on the basis of the opportunist (reformist and centrist) agents of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the working class. They control large layers of the working class through the "working class parties", trade unions, and other working class organizations.

5- People's Front paves the way for Fascism.

The left arm of the bourgeoisie controls the proletariat through the People's Front, while the democracy of the exploiters is assured to the "reactionary" bourgeoisie who openly prepare for the seizure of power. The People's Front paves the way for Fascism.

6 - In revolutions the People's Front cannot hold in check the proletariat nor can it decisively defeat Fascism.

When the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production, in the weak link of the world chain, break out into a revolutionary situation the democratic bourgeois method of rule can no longer suffice. If capitalism is to maintain its rule over the exploited masses, it must establish its open dictatorship. This brings to the surface a political revolution between the exploiters, between democracy and Fascism. But this is only a surface phenomenon of more fundamental antagonisms below. The revolutionary situation flowing from the breakdown represents a SOCIAL REVOLUTION, a struggle between the proletariat and capitalism as a whole. The main struggle is between Fascism and Communism. The revolution creates a condition favorable for the proletariat to break decisively from the People's Front, providing there is a revolutionary party capable of posing and leading in this task. In this three cornered struggle, the People's Front is unable to hold in check the proletariat, and is unable to decisively defeat Fascism. Therein lies the contradiction of bourgeois democracy in decay capitalism. Its usefulness for the exploiters rule becomes antiquated, because the system is OVER-RIPE for Socialism.

7 - Masses behind the People's Front must "fight" Fascism to save themselves.

The masses under the domination of the People's Front, regardless of the "spineless" leadership must fight fascism in order to save their own hides. The effectiveness of their fight under such a leadership is a different question.

8 - People's Front, its agents, and the proletariat.

The People's Front has two aspects: its "democratic bourgeois" section and its agents in the ranks of the proletariat, and (2) the proletariat it controls, through Socialist "Communist" parties, trade unions, etc. (Spain through the FAI and CNT). Revolutionists give no support to the People's Front. They carry on a policy, on the basis of political and organizational independence to win the proletariat and oppressed masses away from the People's Front and its agents. (See document on "March separately and strike together.")

9 - People's Front is the cheapest Bourgeois method of rule.

In decay capitalism the cheapest method of bourgeois rule, depending upon the economic conditions and class relations, is the People's Front which controls the proletariat. When the capitalists are able to rule through the People's Front it reveals internal strength. When they are forced to change to the rule of Fascism, it reveals internal weakness.

1 - Weapon of Finance Capitalism - Fascism.

Fascism is a weapon of Finance Capital forged out of the discontent of the middle class in decay capitalism to crush the proletarian revolution and to save the capitalist system through counter-revolution.

2 - The middle class and the proletariat.

Fascism must have as its base strong middle class movement pressed between the conflict of capital and the workers; a middle class which has no faith in the proletarian solution of the crisis, and therefore, strikes out for its own "independent" solution of the crisis.

3 - The role of the middle class.

The counter-revolutionary movement rallies the middle class and layers of the working class under the banner of the middle class only to serve the interests of finance capital. The middle class cannot lead in the class struggle. It must follow either the working class or the capitalists.

4 - Bourgeois democracy and Fascism.

Bourgeois democracy as a left method of capitalist rule becomes a brake upon the exploiters rule when the proletariat is storming for power. In such periods the ruling class must, besides its legal methods of holding the proletariat in check, use extra-legal methods. This takes on the form of Fascism in developed capitalist countries in the decay stage. When the struggle between capitalism and communism reaches its decisive stage, bourgeois democracy can no longer suffice. If the exploiters are to continue their rule, they must resort to an open dictatorship.

5 - A form of reaction.

Fascism is a special form of reaction, unlike the forms of reaction in developing capitalism, and other dictatorial forms in the present period. It is the final form of bourgeois rule over the proletariat, after accumulation has made rotten ripe the base for socialism and when the proletariat has not carried through its historical task.

6 - Use of demogogy.

Like all forms of reaction Fascism must use demagogy, left phrases,

and speak in the name of the working class in order to win large layers of the oppressed for the interests of the exploiters.

7 - Counter-revolution, not revolution.

Fascism is not a revolutionary movement. It is a counter-revolutionary movement. It does not create a new system. It preserves the decaying capitalist system.

8 - Capitalist structure and Fascism.

While only the embryo forms of the Soviet System exist under capitalism in Dual Power, the fully developed forms and structures of the Fascist system exist. Fascism only reorganizes secondary aspects of capitalist economy and its superstructure, while the Dictatorship of the Proletariat will change the basic mode of production and the whole superstructure.

9 - Fascism as a military fighting machine.

This reactionary movement does not present a new program, does not create new structure; rather it brings to the surface the forces existing in capitalist society, coordinating them into a powerful political and military fighting organization of the exploiters.

10 - After Fascism seizes power.

Once Finance Capital is successful in its struggle to establish Fascism, it begins to transform and strip Fascism of its middle class verbiage, aspirations and interests.

11 - "Unity" of the nation.

The unity of the capitalists within the nation upon the basis of a decisive defeat of the proletariat, to replace the class struggle with "class peace" is the aim of Fascism in order to prepare more effectively for international competitions and war.

12 - Fascism a brake upon further development.

In attempting to construct a corporate state based upon national self sufficiency, Fascism creates further discrepancies between the productive forces and national boundaries, and enlarges competition on the international arena, instead of eliminating wasteful competition. It extends an unproductive economy for war purposes. It checks and destroys necessary social development in the economic, political and social fields, becomes a check upon society and science, art, literature and social progress. It paves the way for a degeneration into barbarism.

January, 1938.

1000000

1000000